

REMARKS

Claim Status:

The present claims are rejected by Simmons alone or in combination with other references, and also by Hawkins in combination with Hung.

In setting forth these rejections, the Examiner states that: "the applicant never really makes any explicit statements about exactly which features of claim 1 the prior art fails to teach". The Examiner also states that a "stand for a jack" is the same as a "jack stand".

Amendment to Claim 1:

To secure the timely issuance of a patent, and without concurring in the Examiner's rejections in any way, claim 1 has been amended to set forth further structural features of the invention not seen in the prior art, as follows.

Claim 1 has been amended to describe the support body as being formed by **two pairs of opposing inwardly slanting sides**. As can be seen in Figs. 1 to 4, such inwardly slanting opposing sides give the present invention a wide base and a narrow top. As a result, the present invention has a "large footprint" that makes the device very resistant to tipping over.

Secondly, claim 1 has been amended to set forth the light source being mounted **in an aperture disposed in one of the inwardly slanting sides of the support body**. Therefore, the light source is co-planar with one of the inwardly slanting sides of the support body (as seen in Figs 1 to 3). This is particularly advantageous in two regards:

(i) First, the light source is not simply mounted onto the side of the device. Stated another way, the light source does not simply "hang onto" a hook or clip protruding from the side of the device. Instead, the present light source is substantially received within

an aperture in one side of the body of the device. As a result, the light source is out of the way of a operator's hands and tools.

(ii) Second, the light is naturally directed at an upward angle. (IE: the light is not simply directed straight upward, or straight horizontally to the side). This is particularly advantageous in providing lighting to the underside of a vehicle positioned on top of the present invention.

In view of the forgoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the present obviousness rejections is respectfully requested.

Amendment to Claim 16:

Claim 16 has been amended to include each of the features set forth in amended claim 1. As a result, reconsideration and withdrawal of the present obviousness rejections is respectfully requested.


Conclusion

For the reasons presented above, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference would advance prosecution of the present application, he is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,
BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: June 7, 2005

By: 
David R. Heckadon
Registration No. 50,184

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(650) 622-2300

94254_1.DOC